



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

mu

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,691	03/23/2004	Parag P. Mehta	QN1094.US	2431

22145 7590 08/22/2007
KLEIN, O'NEILL & SINGH, LLP
43 CORPORATE PARK
SUITE 204
IRVINE, CA 92606

EXAMINER

HUYNH, KIM T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2111

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/22/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/806,691

Applicant(s)

MEHTA ET AL.

Examiner

Kim T. Huynh

Art Unit

2111

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonzalez et al. (Pub. No. US2005/0088445) in view of Anderson et al. (Pub. No. US2005/0910536)

As per claims 1, 8 and 15, Gonzalez discloses a PCI-Express slot for coupling devices to a host system comprising: a PCI-Express connector (fig.6, 220 ie chipset) that can couple at least two devices (fig.6, 670 ie graphics cards) using at least two independent PCI-Express lanes (fig.6, 671 ie PCI Express). (paragraphs 28, 67-68, ie chipset supports 32 PCI Express lanes with being routed into two x16 PCI Express graphics slots) Gonzalez discloses all the limitations as above except connector for receiving a card to couple two set independent set of PCI-Express lanes without using a PCI-Express bridge. However, Anderson discloses docking module couple to expansion module as show in figure 10. In addition, referring figure 7 & 8 PCI Express lanes 266 provided to connect to adapter slot 165, one PCI Express lane to a switch and one PCI Express lane for a USB hub as discloses in paragraph 52. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was

made to incorporate Anderson's teaching into Gonzalez's system so as for making expansion of PCs easier and that enables OEMs to deliver an entry-level PC that is upgradeable while maintaining stability. (paragraph 7)

As per claims 2, 9, 16, Gonzalez discloses where four PCI-Express lanes are used to couple at least two PCI Express devices. (paragraph 28)

As per claims 3, 10, 17, Gonzalez discloses where eight PCI-Express lanes are used to couple at least two PCI Express devices. (paragraph 28)

As per claims 4, 11, 18, Gonzalez discloses where twelve PCI-Express lanes are used to couple at least two PCI Express devices. (paragraph 28)

As per claims 5, 12, 19, Gonzalez discloses where sixteen PCI-Express lanes are used to couple at least two PCI Express devices. (paragraph 28)

As per claims 6, 13, 20, Gonzalez discloses where thirty two PCI-Express lanes are used to couple at least two PCI Express devices. (paragraph 28)

As per claims 7, 14, 21, Gonzalez discloses where .times.2, .times.4, .times.8, .times.12, .times.12, .times.16 or .times.32 PCI-Express lane configurations are used to couple at least two PCI Express devices. (paragraph 28)

Response to Amendment

3. Applicant's amendment filed on 6/14/07 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

a. In response to applicant's argument that Kelly do not disclose connector for receiving a card to couple two set independent set of PCI-Express lanes without using a PCI-Express bridge. However, Anderson discloses docking module couple to expansion module as show in figure 10. In addition, referring figure 7 & 8 PCI Express lanes 266 provided to connect to adapter slot 165, one PCI Express lane to a switch and one PCI Express lane for a USB hub as discloses in paragraph 52. Thus, the prior art teaches the invention as claimed and the amended claims do not distinguish over the prior art as applied.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2111

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kim Huynh whose telephone number is (571)272-3635 or via e-mail addressed to [kim.huynh3@uspto.gov]. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM- 6:00PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached at (571)272-3632 or via e-mail addressed to [mark.rinehart@uspto.gov].

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571)273-8300 for regular communications and After Final communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571)272-2100.

Kim Huynh

August 20, 2007



MARK H. RINEHART
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100